DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 458 151 SO 031 452

AUTHOR Degelman, Charles; Hayes, Bill
TITLE Mock Arbitration--Conflict Resolution in Major League Baseball: Sports and the Law.
INSTITUTION Constitutional Rights Foundation, Los Angeles, CA.
PUB DATE 1996-00-00
NOTE 23p.; For related lesson plans, see SO 031 448-451.
AVAILABLE FROM Constitutional Rights Foundation, 601 South Kingsley Drive, Los Angeles, CA 90005 ($3.95). Tel: 213-487-5590; Fax: 213-386-0459; Web site: http://www.crf-usa.org/.
PUB TYPE Guides - Classroom - Teacher (052)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Arbitration; *Baseball; Citizenship Education; *Conflict Resolution; Intermediate Grades; Law Related Education; Role Playing; Salaries; Secondary Education; *Social Responsibility; Social Studies; *Thinking Skills
IDENTIFIERS Constitutional Rights Foundation; *Professional Sports

ABSTRACT

This lesson plan uses students' interest in sports to teach good citizenship. With its focus on rules, responsibility, conflict resolution, and teamwork, the unit emphasizes the development of critical thinking, decision-making, and citizenship skills in young people. This lesson plan is part of a series of fully prepared, interactive classroom lesson plans offered by the Sports and the Law program of the Constitutional Rights Foundation. Each lesson includes detailed teacher instructions, background information, and student handouts. This lesson introduces students to alternative dispute resolution methods and pays particular attention to arbitration by focusing on the model for salary arbitration established by Major League Baseball (MLB). Students brainstorm different types of conflict resolution, read and discuss an article on alternative dispute resolution methods, and decide which method would best solve some hypothetical disputes. Students then roleplay team attorneys, players' representatives, and arbitrators in a mock MLB salary arbitration hearing. (BT)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 458 151

CRF

MOCK ARBITRATION

CONFLICT RESOLUTION IN MAJOR LEAGUE BASEBALL

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
M. Croddy
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
1

SO 031 452

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

MOCK ARBITRATION
CONFLICT RESOLUTION IN MAJOR LEAGUE BASEBALL

Todd Clark
Executive Director

Marshall Croddy
Director of Programs and Materials Development

Charles Degelman and Bill Hayes
Writers and Editors

Andy Schwich
Curriculum Designer
Director, Sports & the Law

Andrew Costly
Production Manager

CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS FOUNDATION
601 South Kingsley Drive
Los Angeles, CA 90005
(213) 487-5590
(213) 386-0459 FAX

©1996, Constitutional Rights Foundation

Introduction

Constitutional Rights Foundation's Sports and the Law program uses students' interest in sports to teach good citizenship. By learning how rules—on and off the playing field—relate to society, students acquire knowledge necessary to become responsible citizens and effective participants in our democracy. CRF believes that good sportsmanship is good citizenship. With a focus on rules, responsibility, conflict resolution, and teamwork, Sports and the Law emphasizes the development of critical thinking, decision-making, and citizenship skills in young people.

This mini-unit is part a series of fully prepared, interactive classroom lesson plans offered by the Sports and the Law program. Each mini-unit illustrates important aspects of law and society and promotes an understanding of law-related concepts by linking the excitement of sports to broader social issues.

One of the major focuses of the Sports and the Law program is conflict resolution. Our society uses a variety of methods for resolving disputes peacefully—from negotiation among parties to mediation to arbitration to formal court trials. Students are familiar with negotiation and court trials. But less well-known are mediation, in which a neutral party attempts to facilitate an agreement by the parties, and arbitration, in which the parties agree on an arbitrator to decide the dispute for them. As court costs skyrocket, more and more individuals and organizations are turning to mediation and arbitration to resolve disputes.

This lesson introduces students to Alternative Dispute Resolution methods and pays particular attention to arbitration by focusing on an arbitration in sports. If students have encountered the word "arbitration," they likely have heard it in the context of sports. Major League Baseball routinely resorts to arbitration to resolve disputes concerning player salaries. As part of the basic agreement between the players' union and management, the decisions made by an independent arbitrator are considered binding between a respective player and his team.

Overview

This mock arbitration focuses on the model for arbitration established by Major League Baseball.

In Lesson One, students brainstorm different types of conflict resolution. Next, they read and discuss an article on Alternative Dispute Resolution methods. Then in pairs, they decide which method—negotiation, mediation, arbitration, or adjudication—would best resolve some hypothetical disputes.

In Lesson Two, students read and discuss an article on Major League Baseball's use of arbitration for salary disputes. Students then engage in an arbitration simulation based on a hypothetical player-salary dispute.

Objectives

Students will:

1. Brainstorm methods used to resolve conflicts.
2. Understand the concepts of negotiation, mediation, and arbitration.
3. Decide which method of dispute resolution (negotiation, mediation, arbitration, or adjudication) should be used in different situations.
4. Present arguments in a simulated arbitration hearing.
5. Understand the process of arbitration used by Major League Baseball.

Lesson One

Materials and Preparation

- **Handout A: Alternative Dispute Resolution**—1 per student
- **Handout B: How Can We Solve This?**—1 per pair

Procedure

A. Introducing Alternative Dispute Resolution

1. Tell students that your friend Sam is having problems with his neighbor. Each weekend the neighbor plays loud music all day long and late into the night. Ask: What can Sam do to settle this dispute peacefully? (Let students brainstorm ideas, such as talk to the neighbor, call a lawyer, call the police, sue the neighbor. Write student answers on the board.)
2. Tell students Sam has another possibility: alternative dispute resolution. Distribute **Handout A: Alternative Dispute Resolution**. Ask students to read this handout, which explains some different dispute resolution techniques, and to think of which technique would help Sam the most.
3. When students finish, ask the following questions:
   - What are the three ADR methods? How are they different? (Arbitration, mediation, and negotiation. Make sure students understand the following: mediation and arbitration involve bringing in an independent third party. In mediation, the parties

decide. A mediator facilitates the agreement between the parties. In arbitration, the arbitrator decides. The arbitrator listens to the parties and then makes the decision. In negotiation, there is no independent third party. The parties agree among themselves.)

- What are the benefits of ADR methods over the court process? (These benefits are mentioned in the handout: Save time, may save money, more private, more informal [which helps them meet parties' needs easier], parties more active, greater chance of preserving relationships.)
- What are their drawbacks? (Because they are informal, some abuses may take place, such as people lying with no consequences.)
- What situations are best for negotiation? Mediation? Arbitration? Adjudication? (Negotiation: when parties don't need outside help. Mediation: when parties need some help, but can make their own decision. Arbitration: when there's no hope of the parties quickly resolving the conflict themselves. Adjudication: when a formal, independent decision is best and the dispute is worth spending a lot of time on.)
- Which method do you think Sam should use with his neighbor? Why? (Accept various answers.)

B. How Can We Solve This?—Paired Activity

1. Tell students you are going to give them a few more situations to decide which dispute resolution method should be used: negotiation, mediation, arbitration, or adjudication.
2. Divide the class into pairs. Distribute **Handout B, How Can We Solve This?,** to each pair. Explain that students should:
   - read each case.
   - circle which technique would be best for each.
   - give the reason for each decision.
3. When students finish, debrief the activity by reading each case and asking students which technique they recommended and why.

Lesson Two

Materials and Preparation

- **Handout C: Arbitration and Baseball**—1 per student
- **Handout D: Mock Arbitration Materials**—1 per student

Procedure

A. Arbitration and Baseball—Reading and Discussion

1. Ask students: Do you know how Major League Baseball settles important salary disputes? (Inform students that Major League Baseball uses arbitration—one of the Alternative Dispute Resolution methods.)
2. Distribute **Handout C, Arbitration and Baseball**, to each student. This handout explains how baseball arrived at using arbitration for salary disputes. Tell students to read the handout and find out how baseball arbitration works.
3. When students finish reading, ask the following:
   - How did the players gain arbitration for salaries? (Through their collective bargaining agreement negotiated by the union.)
   - How does the arbitration work? (Make sure they understand that [1] the arbitrator must choose between the player's demand and the club's offer; [2] the arbitrator can base the decision only on certain facts; [3] the arbitration is final.)
   - Do you think the arbitrator should be able to choose a compromise salary instead of choosing between the owner's offer and player's demand? Why or why not? (Accept various answers, but make sure students understand the rationale for the arbitrator not settling on a compromise: That it keeps owners from making ridiculously low offers and players from making outlandishly high demands.)

B. Preparation for Activity

1. Tell students that they are going to take part in a mock arbitration over Billy Ray Perkins, a fictional shortstop for a fictional team, the Birds. Distribute **Handout D, Mock Arbitration Materials**, to each student. Read aloud to students the "newspaper article" **Birds' Perkins Seeks $4.5 Million**.
2. After reading, ask the following questions:
   - How much money is Perkins demanding from the Birds? ($4.5 million)
   - How much are the Birds offering? ($3.5 million)
   - How are the Birds and Perkins going to resolve the salary dispute? (In an arbitration hearing)
   - Why does Perkins think he should be paid more? (He's had a great career.)
   - Why don't the Birds want to pay him more? (He's been injured and they have a new player coming up.)

3. Inform students that the arbitrator will consider two primary factors in making the decision: (1) how well he performs compared to other shortstops and (2) how well he is paid compared to other shortstops.

C. Mock Arbitration

1. Divide the class into groups of 5–6 students each (preferably 5). Assign two students in each group to be representatives for Perkins. Assign two others to be Birds' representatives. Assign one student the role of arbitrator. (If you have six in a group, assign this person as another arbitrator.)

2. Review **Role-Play Instructions**. Emphasize the following points:

   - The arbitrator will decide on either $3.5 million or $4.5 million. No compromise is allowed.
   - Each representative will have two minutes to talk.
   - Perkins' representatives will argue that:
     1) he outperforms other shortstops.
     (2) $4.5 million is reasonable compared to the pay of other shortstops.
   - Birds' representatives will argue that:
     (1) Perkins does not outperform other shortstops.
     (2) $3.5 million is reasonable compared to the pay of other shortstops.

2. Regroup the class so students can consult with one another while preparing for the role-play. Perkins' representatives should sit on one side of the room, Birds' representatives on another side, and arbitrators in front. The representatives should think up their best arguments and the arbitrators should think of questions to ask each side.

3. Reassemble the groups of 5–6 students and begin the role-play. Call time for all the groups according to the following schedule:

   Birds' representative #1.....2 minutes

   Perkins' representative #1..2 minutes

   Birds' representative #2.....2 minutes

   Perkins' representative #2..2 minutes

   Arbitrator's questions.....3 minutes

   Remind them the arbitrator can interrupt anytime to ask questions.

4. When the role play ends, allow the arbitrators time to make their decisions. Then call on them give their decisions and the reason they decided as they did.

5. Debrief the role-play by asking:

   What were some strong arguments? Why?

   Do you think it's a good idea that Major League Baseball does not allow the arbitrator to compromise on the figure? Why or why not?

   Do you think arbitration is a good way to settle salary disputes? Why or why not?

ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION METHODS

America has a long tradition of using the court system to settle disputes peacefully. Although it has worked for many years, the system has drawbacks. It's expensive, time-consuming, and stressful on participants. In recent years, more and more disputes are being settled by Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) methods. These are techniques people can use to resolve conflicts without going to court. They are becoming a popular way of dealing with problems in business, families, neighborhoods, government, international disputes, and in the legal system.

The three most well-know ADR methods are **arbitration**, **mediation**, and **negotiation**. Although many people use these terms interchangeably, in reality the three differ greatly.

Arbitration

In arbitration, the disputing parties allow a third party—an **arbitrator**—to settle the dispute. The arbitrator, usually trained in arbitration methods, has expertise that helps him or her to understand the problem. When people decide that they want to arbitrate a dispute, they often contact an arbitration service. The service assigns an arbitrator to the case. Sometimes two or three people may be assigned as an **arbitration panel**.

At the arbitration hearing, each person explains his or her story, and the arbitrator decides the outcome. Like in a courtroom, there are procedural rules and rules about what kind of evidence may be presented. Arbitration is the most formal ADR method.

The decision that an arbitrator makes can be **binding**. This means both parties must accept it—no matter what. Thus all parties take a risk when entering arbitration. The results could go against them.

In some places, a court will order parties to go through arbitration before their court trial. In these instances, the arbitrator's decision is not binding unless the parties agree in advance. Many cases are resolved in court-ordered arbitration, saving much time.

Because it is fast, arbitration is often used in business and labor disputes.

© 1996, Constitutional Rights Foundation

Mediation

Mediation differs from arbitration in several ways. It is much more informal. It is usually a private process with a neutral third party—a **mediator**. Instead of deciding on a solution, the mediator helps the parties reach their own solution. The mediator cannot make binding decisions. The mediator's job is to keep the parties talking to each other so they can agree on a solution.

Mediation is more flexible than arbitration. It's more like a discussion than a courtroom or arbitration hearing. There are no limits on time or types of evidence. It allows the parties to discuss and understand all viewpoints so they can reach a mutually beneficial agreement.

Mediation saves time and money. Like negotiation, it's a good method for those who prefer privacy and are interested in preserving relationships.

Negotiation

Negotiation is used by ordinary people every day. Whenever people settle disagreements by talking them over, they have negotiated.

Negotiation differs from mediation and arbitration. There is no independent third party in negotiation: The parties talk to each other in an effort to reach an agreement. There are no rules or formal structure.

Negotiation works best when creative solutions are possible. It's also effective for problems between people with ongoing relationships, because it relies on trust and open channels of communication. The goal of negotiators is to reach a "win-win" situation.

Negotiation is commonly used in making contracts. Parties who want to strike a business deal usually negotiate the agreement and sign a contract.

Why Use ADR Methods?

There are many benefits to using ADR instead of the court system:

They usually save time. Unlike the court system, ADR methods do not require participants to wait long periods of time (sometimes years) to get a hearing date. Nor is there much paperwork or preparation, especially in mediation. Because there are fewer rules and procedures to follow, ADR sessions are usually much shorter than court trials.

They are often cheaper. Lawyers are not required, but may be used. When lawyers are used in ADR hearings, their fees are usually less expensive because the hearings are much shorter than court proceedings.

© 1996, Constitutional Rights Foundation

They are more private. Unless the parties agree, almost all court cases are on public record. Many people don't like that anyone can access court records and find out about their problems. Many ADR methods are less formal and do not go on the public record. And the parties can always agree to keep things confidential so that no one else will know about their dispute.

They are more informal. Although ADR methods vary in formality, all are less formal than the court process. Since they are less formal, they can more easily accommodate the needs, concerns, and time schedules of the parties. They can also more easily help parties reach a compromise. In the courtroom, there is usually a happy winner and an unhappy loser. With ADR, it's possible to find a "win-win" solution.

Parties play a more active role. Researchers have found that people who actively take part in reaching a decision are much more likely to be satisfied with that decision. Thus parties using ADR methods are less likely to want to change the outcome.

ADR methods offer parties greater hope of preserving their relationship. Disputes can arise in any relationship—friends, neighbors, family members, co-workers, landlord-tenant. In many situations, parties want a resolution to the problem but don't want to destroy their relationship. Going to court places great stress on any relationship, often damaging it beyond repair. ADR methods help parties preserve their relationship.

What Are the Drawbacks of ADR?

Many of the benefits mentioned above can be drawbacks in some situations. For example, because they are less structured, there is no sworn testimony in ADR proceedings. So there is not much a person can do if he or she later finds out that someone made false statements.

For Discussion

1. What are the three ADR methods? How are they different?
2. What are the benefits of ADR methods over the court process?
3. What are their drawbacks?
4. Which method do you think would work best among friends? Business associates? Why?

© 1996, Constitutional Rights Foundation

HOW CAN WE SOLVE THIS?

Read each case below. Circle whether you would recommend negotiation, mediation, arbitration, or adjudication (court) to solve the problem. Explain your reason for each choice.

Case #1: After carrying on talks with the school district for more than six months, the teacher's union has called a strike. The teachers' demands and the district's offer are far apart. The strike could last for months.

What would you recommend? (Circle one.)

negotiation mediation arbitration adjudication

Your reasons:

Case #2: Marcia and Mike, who don't know each other, got into a car accident. While neither one suffered any injury, both cars had significant damage. Both think the other person was at fault. What would you recommend? (Circle one.)

negotiation mediation arbitration adjudication

Your reasons:

© 1996, Constitutional Rights Foundation

Case #3: Karen and Jerry were going to get married, but Jerry changed his mind and wants the diamond ring he gave Karen back. Karen refuses to give it to him.

What would you recommend? (Circle one.)

negotiation mediation arbitration adjudication

Your reasons:

Case #4: Maria wants to sell her computer business for $2 million. Seth wants to buy it, but does not want to spend more than $1.5 million.

What would you recommend? (Circle one.)

negotiation mediation arbitration adjudication

Your reasons:

Case #5: Joe Santana hit 30 home runs and batted .294 for the Reds last year. He has demanded a $5 million salary. After weeks of talks, the highest the Reds will go is $3.5 million.

What would you recommend? (Circle one.)

negotiation mediation arbitration adjudication

Your reasons:

© 1996, Constitutional Rights Foundation

ARBITRATION AND BASEBALL

In any job situation, disputes will arise between employers and employees. Baseball is no exception. Disagreements arise between players and their bosses—the team owners. Most of them revolve around issues of salary, pensions, benefits, or trades.

In baseball's early years, the owners had tremendous power over the players. They decided where a player played and how much he was paid. An individual player had almost no control over his career, except to decide when to quit.

In 1954, the players formed a union, the Major League Baseball Players Association (MLBPA). Beginning in 1967, the union negotiated a series of **collective bargaining agreements**. These were contracts between the union and the owners on minimum salaries, playing conditions, pensions, free agency, and many other things.

In the 1974 collective bargaining agreement, the owners agreed to allow individual players negotiating new contracts to submit salary disputes to arbitration. To be eligible, a player had to be in the major leagues between two and six years (the minimum was raised to three years in 1987). The player could only submit his grievance during a certain time period each year. Once submitted, the salary arbitrator—a person chosen by both players and owners—was required to choose between the player's salary demand and the owner's offer. The arbitrator could not create a compromise solution. This was designed to keep both sides from making outlandish demands and offers.

The arbitrator could base his or her decision only on the following information:

- The player's contribution to the club in the last season.
- The length and consistency of his performance
- The history of his past salary
- Comparative players' salaries
- Medical/injury information
- The club's recent standing and attendance records

© 1996, Constitutional Rights Foundation

No other information could be part of the arbitrator's decision. This meant the arbitrator could not consider the player's financial situation, personal comments or testimonials, or offers by other clubs. The arbitrator's decision is final and binding.

Since 1974, approximately 100 players have filed for salary arbitration each year. Most cases—close to 90 percent—do not go to a hearing. They are settled at a compromised figure. Of the cases that have gone to an arbitration hearing, the owners have won close to 60 percent.

For Discussion

1. How did the players gain arbitration for salaries?
2. How does the arbitration work?
3. Do you think the arbitrator should be able to choose a compromise salary instead of choosing between the owner's offer and player's demand? Why or why not?

© 1996, Constitutional Rights Foundation

Birds' Perkins Seeks $4.5 Million

Baseball: Player files for arbitration

By Joseph P. Schimps, TIMES STAFF WRITER

Bird shortstop Billy Ray Perkins was among 100 eligible players who exchanged salary figures with their respective teams Monday. Perkins is asking for $4.5 million per year through arbitration, an increase of $1.5 million from his previous contract. The Birds countered with an offer of $3.5 million. The hearing to decide the 1997 salary figure will be held during the first three weeks of February.

According to the collective bargaining agreement between the players union and management, any player without a contract who has three or more years of major league service is eligible for arbitration. Perkins originally signed a contract with the Birds in 1992 after a spectacular two-sport college career at the University of Alabama, which included his being awarded the Heisman Trophy as the outstanding college football player in 1991.

Perkins, 27, was enjoying the finest season of his career when he injured his knee and went on the disabled list on August 10. He was hitting .297 with 8 home runs and 56 RBIs and was the starting shortstop for the National League in the All-Star Game for the second consecutive season. He has a lifetime .282 average in five seasons with the Birds, in addition to receiving three Gold.Glove awards and Rookie of the Year in 1992.

"Obviously, they have been concerned about the progress of my knee, but it feels great," said Perkins, who underwent arthroscopic surgery August 14. "I honestly never thought that we would get to the point where arbitration was necessary," Perkins said. "I don't think they've shown me the kind of respect I feel I have earned in the last five seasons," added Perkins, who was reached by phone from his winter home in Alabama.

Birds Vice President Robert Shannon was not surprised by Perkins' bid. Negotiations had broken down regarding the length of the contract as well as the salary figure. "We were not willing to offer a four-year contract," said Shannon. Another source close to the club revealed that Bird officials are concerned that Perkins' knee has been slow in responding to treatment.

Under the bargaining agreement, Perkins would be eligible for free agency at the end of the 1997 season. He is expected to be pushed in spring training by newcomer Andre Fontana, the AAA Player of the Year last season. In the AAA in 1996, Fontana hit .342 and stole 58 bases in addition to slugging 16 home runs and 73 RBIs, but he also committed 26 errors. After being called up from the AAA on August 10, Fontana hit .271 with 4 home runs and 13 RBIs, while committing 6 errors in 23 games.

© 1996, Constitutional Rights Foundation

ROLE-PLAY INSTRUCTIONS

(page 1)

When the role play begins, each player representative and team counsel will be given a two-minute turn to speak. During these two-minute periods, the arbitrator can interrupt to ask questions. At the end, the arbitrator will be given an additional three minutes to ask questions. Then the arbitrator must decide for the player or for the Birds based on the criteria below. Read the rest of this handout carefully and prepare for the role play.

Criteria: The arbitrator must decide based solely on the following:

- The player's contribution to the club in the last season
- The length and consistency of his performance
- The history of his past salary
- Comparative players' salaries
- Medical/injury information
- The club's recent standing and attendance records (Note: The Birds did well in the standings and have good attendance.)

The arbitrator will make the final, binding decision after hearing arguments from both sides. Four charts have been provided, which offer information on performance (one-on-one comparison of career statistics, comparison of career statistics among other shortstops, comparison of 1996 statistics) as well as on salary (length of major league service and 1997 contract status).

Representatives for Perkins: You represent Billy Ray Perkins. As player reps, your job is to convince the arbitrator that Perkins should be awarded $4.5 million salary for 1997. Look at the criteria above, which the arbitrator will use to make the decision. Use the news story and the statistics to make your case. Try to show that Perkins is a superior performer and deserves more money than other shortstops. In particular, find reasons why Perkins deserves a higher salary than Ricardo Arias, who will be paid $4 million in 1997.

Team Counsel: You represent the Birds. You must provide information to the arbitrator establishing that Perkins' salary request is too high and that he should be awarded the figure of $3.5 million. Look at the criteria above, which the arbitrator will use to make the decision. Use the news story and

© 1996, Constitutional Rights Foundation

ROLE-PLAY INSTRUCTIONS

(page 2)

the statistics to make your case. Try to show that Perkins is no longer a superior performer and does not deserve more money than other shortstops. In particular, find reasons why Ricardo Arias, who will be paid $4 million in 1997, deserves a higher salary than Perkins.

Arbitrators: As an independent arbitrator, you have been approved by both sides for this particular case. Your decision on the salary is final. Be sure to:

Listen carefully to the arguments presented by both sides before making your decision.

Choose to award Perkins $3.5 million or $4.5 million. There is no neutral decision or compromise allowed in the case.

Base your decision on the criteria above.

Prepare to give the reason for your decision to the class.

© 1996, Constitutional Rights Foundation

COMPARATIVE STATISTICS

(page 1)

Exhibit 1: Perkins vs. Arias (one-on-one comparison)

This chart provides a comparison of the career statistics for Billy Ray Perkins and Ricardo Arias, second baseman for the Chicago Cubs. Presenting records in the same format for the purpose of comparison is known as a one-on-one. This approach is used in nearly every arbitration case, and a case may include dozens of such comparisons. Arias is important to this case because he and Perkins are both middle infielders with comparable statistics in five years of major league service.

Billy Ray Perkins, Birds

YEAR	G	AB	R	H	HR	RBI	SB	CS	BA	OBP	E
1992	146	569	56	160	4	47	31	5	.281	.348	14
1993	142	554	49	145	6	43	24	4	.262	.311	12
1994	159	620	61	179	7	61	41	8	.289	.354	7
1995	155	604	57	170	6	54	32	6	.282	.331	9
1996	118	449	62	133	8	56	36	8	.297	.365	8
TOTAL	**720**	**2735**	**285**	**788**	**31**	**261**	**164**	**31**	**.288**	**.339**	**50**

Ricardo Arias, Chicago Cubs

YEAR	G	AB	R	H	HR	RBI	SB	CS	BA	OBP	E
1992	143	545	69	145	1	46	24	6	.266	.328	15
1993	158	623	77	184	0	27	42	17	.295	.347	12
1994	147	586	67	168	0	35	24	7	.287	.340	14
1995	161	637	53	188	1	43	53	11	.295	.354	18
1996	152	571	58	177	2	50	49	9	.310	.405	11
TOTAL	**761**	**2962**	**324**	**862**	**4**	**201**	**192**	**50**	**.291**	**.355**	**70**

© 1996, Constitutional Rights Foundation

COMPARATIVE STATISTICS

(page 2)

Exhibit 2: Perkins vs. Other Shortstops

These are the career statistics for the most productive, active major league shortstops through the 1996 season:

PLAYER	G	AB	R	H	HR	RBI	SB	CS	BA	OBP	E
B.R. Perkins	**720**	**2735**	**285**	**788**	**31**	**261**	**164**	**31**	**.288**	**.339**	**50**
J. Bentley	669	2444	349	627	39	239	38	22	.257	.320	71
T. Faldez	1328	5132	675	1465	48	479	181	91	.285	.338	120
T. Flynn	376	1448	184	388	50	214	23	12	.268	.318	57
G. Giordani	1140	3386	452	844	69	335	79	55	.249	.292	46
B. Lopes	835	3122	478	924	70	368	148	33	.296	.355	77
C. Roberts	1800	6942	1043	1922	273	1014	32	27	.277	.347	117
O. Stanford	2208	8087	1079	2108	22	681	542	129	.261	.338	131

Below is a comparison of length of major league service and 1997 contract status and salary for the same eight shortstops and Ricardo Arias:

PLAYER	AGE	YEARS	'97 SALARY	CONTRACT STATUS
B.R.Perkins	**27**	**5**	**$ 4.5/3.5 m.**	**Arbitration**
J. Bentley	271	7	$ 3.1 m.	Through 1998
T. Faldez	31	10	$ 3.33 m.	Through 1999
T. Flynn	24	3	$ 2.5 m.	Through 1998
G. Giordani	31	10	$ 3.25 m.	Through 1997
B. Lopes	29	7	$ 4.1 m.	Through 1997
C. Roberts	32	12	$ 5.33 m.	Through 2000
O. Stanford	38	15	$ 5.0 m.	Through 1999
R. Arias	**25**	**5**	**$ 4.0 m.**	**Through 1998**

© 1996, Constitutional Rights Foundation

COMPARATIVE STATISTICS

(page 3)

Exhibit 3: 1996 Statistics

This chart provides a closer look at the quality of Billy Ray Perkins' 1996 performance in relation to his most productive peers at shortstop and second baseman Arias:

PLAYER	G	AB	R	H	HR	RBI	SB	CS	BA	OBP	E
B.R.Perkins	**118**	**449**	**62**	**133**	**8**	**56**	**36**	**8**	**.297**	**.365**	**8**
J.Bentley	159	632	87	167	9	55	7	5	.264	.326	22
T.Faldez	155	622	84	171	4	37	20	20	.275	.337	11
T.Flynn	161	659	87	175	20	96	8	4	.266	.316	20
G.Giordani	146	439	53	108	7	39	6	7	.246	.280	18
B.Lopes	140	533	76	162	12	78	15	4	.304	.377	11
C.Roberts	162	637	73	160	14	72	4	3	.251	.323	12
O.Stanford	132	518	73	153	0	31	43	9	.295	.367	10
R. Arias	**152**	**571**	**58**	**177**	**2**	**50**	**49**	**9**	**.310**	**.405**	**11**

© 1996, Constitutional Rights Foundation

GLOSSARY OF ABBREVIATIONS USED IN BASEBALL STATISTICS

G	Games—number of games played
AB	At Bats—number of official at bats
R	Runs—number of runs scored
H	Hits—number of successful hits
2B	Doubles—number of two-base hits
3B	Triples—number of three-base hits
HR	Home Runs—number of four-base hits
RBI	Runs Batted In—number of runs driven in; a home run is counted as an additional RBI
SB	Stolen Bases—number of bases stolen
CS	Caught Stealing—number of times thrown out attempting to steal a base
BA	Batting Average—a decimal (e.g., .275) based on the number of successful hits achieved in relation to the number of official at bats; to figure a batting average, the number of hits are divided by the number of at bats
OBP	On-Base Percentage—a decimal (e.g., .374) based on the number of successful hits and bases on balls (walks) received in relation to the number of official at bats; to figure the on-base percentage, the number of hits and walks are divided by the number of at bats
E	Errors—number of fielding errors committed

© 1996, Constitutional Rights Foundation

CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS FOUNDATION
601 South Kingsley Drive
Los Angeles, CA 90005
(213) 487-5590
(213) 386-0459 Fax